



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/056,887

01/25/2002

Vincent E. DeGiulio

33836000002

2876

30498

7590

06/27/2006

ACCENTURE

C/O VEDDER PRICE KAUFMAN & KAMMHOLZ, P.C.

222 NORTH LASALLE STREET

CHICAGO, IL 60601

EXAMINER

BURGESS, BARBARA N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2157

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to Amendments filed April 12, 2006. Claims 20-25, 53-61 have been withdrawn. Claims 14-16 and 35-41 are currently cancelled as requested by Applicant. Claims 1-13, 17-19, 26-34, and 42-52 are present for further examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 9-13, 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cook (US Patent 5,621,892).

As per claim 1, Cook discloses a computer architecture for tracking a plurality of objects, wherein the computer architecture is coupled to a status tracking structure that provides event information regarding at least a portion of the plurality of objects, the computer architecture comprising:

- An event table for storing the event information (column 4, lines 62-66, column 5, lines 58-59, column 7, lines 30-33);
- A rule execution component, coupled to the event table, that processes the event

Art Unit: 2157

information in accordance with at least one rule, wherein the at least one rule tests for non-optimal use of at least one object of the plurality of objects (column 4, lines 10-15, 32-40, column 7, lines 55-65);

- An event engine component, coupled to the status tracking structure and the event table, that receives the event information, stores the event information in the event table and, in response to the receipt of the event information, causes the rule execution component to process the event information in accordance with at least a portion of the at least one rule (column 3, lines 62-67, column 4, lines 1-5, 21-30, 50-53, 60-67, column 5, lines 39-50).

As per claim 2, Cook discloses the computer architecture of claim 1, further comprising: a configuration engine component, coupled to the rule execution component, that periodically causes the rule execution component to process the event information in accordance with some of the at least one rule (column 4, lines 50-55).

As per claim 5, Cook discloses a computer architecture for tracking a plurality of objects, wherein the computer architecture is coupled to a status tracking structure that provides event information regarding at least a portion of the plurality of objects, the computer architecture comprising:

- An event table for storing the event information (column 4, lines 62-66, column 5, lines 58-59, column 7, lines 30-33);

Art Unit: 2157

- A rule execution component, coupled to the event table, that processes the event information in accordance with at least one rule, wherein at least one rule tests for non-optimal use of at least one object of the plurality of objects (column 4, lines 10-15, 32-40, column 7, lines 55-65);
- A configuration engine component, coupled to the rule execution component, that periodically causes the rule execution component to process the event information in accordance with at least a portion of the at least one rule (column 3, lines 62-67, column 4, lines 1-5, 21-30, 50-53, 60-67, column 5, lines 39-50).

As per claim 6, Cook discloses the computer architecture of claim 5, wherein the at least one rule comprises at least two rules, and wherein configuration engine component associates at least two execution frequencies with the at least two rules such that a portion of the at least two rules is executed with a frequency different from other rules of the at least two rules (column 3, lines 60-67, column 4, lines 1-2, 36-40).

As per claim 9, Cook discloses a computer architecture for tracking a plurality of objects, wherein the computer architecture is coupled to a status tracking structure that provides event information regarding at least a portion of the plurality of objects, the computer architecture comprising:

- An event table for storing the event information (column 4, lines 62-66, column 5, lines 58-59, column 7, lines 30-33);
- A rule storage component (column 5, lines 32-37);

Art Unit: 2157

- A rule execution component, coupled to the event table and the rule storage component, that processes the event information in accordance with at least one rule stored in the rule storage component, and wherein the rule storage component permits modification of any of the at least one rule independent of the rule execution component, wherein the at least one rule tests for non-optimal use of at least one object of the plurality of objects (column 4, lines 10-15, 32-40, column 7, lines 55-65).

As per claim 10, Cook discloses the computer architecture of claim 9, further comprising:

an event engine component, coupled to the status tracking structure and the event table, that receives the event information, stores the event information in the event table and, in response, causes the rule execution component to process the event information in accordance with at least one immediate rule of the at least one rule (column 3, lines 62-67, column 4, lines 1-5, 21-30, 50-53, 60-67, column 5, lines 39-50).

As per claim 11, Cook discloses the computer architecture of claim 9, further comprising:

a configuration engine component, coupled to the rule execution component, that periodically causes the rule execution component to process the event information in accordance with at least one periodic rule of the at least one rule (column 4, lines 50-55).

As per claim 17, Cook discloses a computer architecture for tracking a plurality of objects, wherein the computer architecture is coupled to a status tracking structure that provides event information regarding at least a portion of the plurality of objects, the computer architecture comprising:

- An event table for storing the event information (column 4, lines 62-66, column 5, lines 58-59, column 7, lines 30-33);
- An alert table for storing alerts (column 4, lines 62-66, column 5, lines 58-59, column 7, lines 30-33);
- A rule execution component, coupled to the event table, that processes the event information in accordance with at least one rule stored in the rule storage component, and that stores the alerts in the alert table when any of the at least one rule is violated, wherein at least one rule tests for non-optimal use of at least one object of the plurality of objects (column 4, lines 10-15, 32-40, column 7, lines 55-65);
- An event dispatcher, coupled to the rule execution component and the alert table, that accesses the alert table, when requested by a client, and sends information regarding at least a portion of the alerts to the client (column 3, lines 62-67, column 4, lines 1-5, 21-30, 50-53, 60-67, column 5, lines 39-50).

As per claim 18, Cook discloses the computer architecture of claim 17, further comprising:

a configuration engine component, operably coupled to the client, that provides at least one polling interval to the client, wherein the client sends alert requests to the event dispatcher based on the at least one polling interval (column 6, lines 10-30).

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 26-34 and 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Elliott (US Patent 6,509,830 B1)

As per claim 26, Elliott discloses in a system for tracking a plurality of objects comprising a tracking manager coupled to a status tracking structure that provides event information regarding at least a portion of the plurality of objects, a client device that communicates with the tracking manager, the client device comprising:

- A communication interface for communicating with the tracking manager (column 3, lines 40-44, 65-67, column 6, lines 8-11, column 7, lines 52-59, 65-67);
- A processing device coupled to the communication interface (column 3, lines 40-44, column 6, lines 8-10, column 7, lines 41-44, 52-53, 65-67);

Art Unit: 2157

A memory, coupled to the processing device, comprising executable instructions that, when executed by the processing device, cause the client device to comprise:

- An alert controller that, in response to configuration information provided by the tracking manager, periodically requests alerts from the tracking manager (column 11, lines 59-67, column 12, lines 1-5).

As per claim 27, Elliott discloses the client device of claim 26, further comprising a display, coupled to the processing device, that displays a graphic indicative of a number of alerts at each of a plurality of alert levels (column 12, lines 30-36, 43-51).

As per claim 28, Elliott discloses the client device of claim 26 wherein the alerts provided by the tracking manager are sent to the device via SOAP-enabled Web Services (column 41-47, column 12, lines 33-50).

As per claim 29, Elliott discloses the client device of claim 26, wherein the configuration information comprises at least one polling interval provided by the tracking manager, wherein the alert controller periodically requests the alerts based on the at least one polling interval (column 9, lines 35-40).

As per claim 30, Elliott discloses in a system for tracking a plurality of objects comprising a tracking manager coupled to a status tracking structure that provides

Art Unit: 2157

event information regarding at least a portion of the plurality of objects, a method in the tracking manager comprising:

- Receiving the event information (column 7, lines 7-30, column 9, lines 57-65, column 10, lines 1-15);
- Processing the event information in accordance with at least one immediate rule in response to receipt of the event information, wherein the at least one rule tests for non-optimal use of at least one object of the plurality of objects (column 10, lines 30-49, column 11, lines 4-15).

As per claim 31, Elliott discloses the method of claim 30, wherein processing of the event information further comprises processing the event information in accordance with periodic rules of the at least one rule (column 5, lines 63-67, column 6, lines 1-5).

As per claim 32, Elliott discloses the method of claim 30 wherein the event information comprises location information corresponding to the plurality of objects (column 2, lines 26-28, column 5, lines 40-45).

As per claim 33, Elliott discloses the method of claim 30 wherein the event information comprises environmental information corresponding to the plurality of objects (column 2, lines 26-28).

Art Unit: 2157

As per claim 34, Elliott discloses a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions stored thereon for performing the method of claim 30 (column 3, lines 35-67).

As per claim 42, Elliott discloses in a system for tracking a plurality of objects comprising a tracking manager coupled to a status tracking structure that provides event information regarding t least a portion of the plurality of objects, a method in the tracking manager comprising:

- Receiving the event information (column 7, lines 7-30, column 9, lines 57-65, column 10, lines 1-15);
- Processing the event information in accordance with at least one rule, wherein the at least one rule tests for non-optimal use of at least one object of the plurality of objects (column 10, lines 30-49, column 11, lines 4-15);
- Generating at least one alert when any of the at least one rule is violated (column 7, lines 1-6, column 10, lines 5-15, 46-49);
- Receiving an alert request from a client in communication with the tracking manager (column 11, lines 59-67, column 12, lines 1-5);
- Sending, in response to the alert request, information regarding at least a portion of the at least one alert to the client (column 12, lines 18-25).

As per claim 43, Elliott discloses the method of claim 42, further comprising:

Art Unit: 2157

providing at least one polling interval to the client, wherein the alert request is sent by the client based on the at least one polling interval (column 9, lines 35-40).

As per claim 44, Elliott discloses the method of claim 42 wherein the information regarding the at least a portion of the at least one alert is sent to the client via SOAP-enabled Web Services (column 41-47, column 12, lines 33-50).

5. Claims 45, 50-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dev et al. (hereinafter "Dev", US Patent 6,049,828).

As per claim 45, Dev discloses in a system for tracking a plurality of objects comprising a tracking manager coupled to a status tracking structure that provides event information regarding at least a portion of the plurality of objects, and a client device that communicates with the tracking manager, a method in the client device comprising:

- Receiving at least one polling interval from the tracking manager (column 9, lines 35-45);
- Sending, to the tracking manager, an event information request based on the at least one polling interval (column 7, lines 14-20);
- Receiving, from the tracking manager in response to the event information request, information regarding at least a portion of the event information (column 8, lines 11-20, 31-37).

Art Unit: 2157

As per claim 50, Dev discloses in a system for tracking a plurality of objects comprising a tracking manager coupled to a status tracking structure that provides event information regarding at least a portion of the plurality of objects, and a client device that communicates with the tracking manager, a method in the client device comprising:

- Receiving at least one polling interval from the tracking manager (column 7, lines 25-30);
- Sending, to the tracking manager, an alert request based on the at least one polling interval (column 7, lines 14-20);
- Receiving, from the tracking manager in response to the alert request, information regarding at least a portion of alerts stored by the tracking manager (column 8, lines 11-20, 31-37).

As per claim 51, Dev disclose the method of claim 50, further comprising: displaying a graphic indicative of a number of alerts at each of a plurality of alert levels (column 14, lines 51-65).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2157

7. Claims 3-4, 7-8, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook (US Patent 5,621,892) in view of Elliott (US Patent 6,509,830 B1).

As per claim 3, Cook discloses the computer architecture of claim 1.

Cook does not explicitly disclose wherein the event information comprises location information corresponding to the plurality of objects.

However, in an analogous art, Elliott discloses receiving location parameters indicating a geographic location (column 2, lines 26-28, column 5, lines 40-45).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Elliott's event information comprising location information in Cook's architecture in order to determine whether tracked devices are in a permissible location.

As per claim 4, Cook discloses the computer architecture of claim 1.

Cook does not explicitly disclose wherein the event information comprises environmental information corresponding to the plurality of objects.

However, in an analogous art, Elliott discloses receiving data associated with environment (column 2, lines 26-28).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Elliott's event information comprising environment information in Cook's architecture in order to determine the environment of a tracked device.

As per claim 7, Cook discloses the computer architecture of claim 5.

Cook does not explicitly disclose wherein the event information comprises location information corresponding to the plurality of objects.

However, in an analogous art, Elliott discloses receiving location parameters indicating a geographic location (column 2, lines 26-28, column 5, lines 40-45).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Elliott's event information comprising location information in Cook's architecture in order to determine whether tracked devices are in a permissible location.

As per claim 8, Cook discloses the computer architecture of claim 5.

Cook does not explicitly disclose wherein the event information comprises environmental information corresponding to the plurality of objects.

However, in an analogous art, Elliott discloses receiving data associated with environment (column 2, lines 26-28).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Elliott's event information comprising environment information in Cook's architecture in order to determine the environment of a tracked device.

As per claim 19, Cook discloses the computer architecture of claim 17.

Art Unit: 2157

Cook does not explicitly disclose wherein the event dispatcher causes the information regarding the at least a portion of the alerts to be sent to the client via SOAP-enabled Web Services.

However, in an analogous art, Elliott discloses the user receiving tracking information via a webpage (column 41-47, column 12, lines 33-50).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Elliott's event information sent via SOAP-enabled Web Services in Cook's architecture enabling the user to provide subscriber information and receive information on a particular tracked device via a webpage.

8. Claims 46-49, 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dev et al. (hereinafter "Dev", US Patent 6,049,828) in view of Elliott (US Patent 6,509,830 B1).

As per claim 46, Dev discloses the method of claim 45.

Dev does not explicitly disclose further comprising:

sending a map data request to the tracking manager;

receiving map data from the tracking manager in response to the map data request.

However, in an analogous art, Elliott discloses receiving location parameters indicating a geographic location (column 2, lines 26-28, column 5, lines 40-45).

Art Unit: 2157

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Elliott's event information comprising location information in Dev's architecture in order to determine whether tracked devices are in a permissible location.

As per claim 47, Dev discloses the method of claim 46.

Dev does not explicitly disclose wherein the event information request is based at least in part upon the map data, wherein the portion of the event information corresponds to the map data.

However, in an analogous art, Elliott discloses receiving location parameters indicating a geographic location (column 2, lines 26-28, column 5, lines 40-45).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Elliott's event information comprising location information in Dev's architecture in order to determine whether tracked devices are in a permissible location.

As per claim 48, Dev discloses the method of claim 47, further comprising: displaying the portion of the event information (column 4, lines 19-35).

As per claim 49, Dev discloses the method of claim 45.

Art Unit: 2157

Dev does not explicitly disclose wherein receiving the information regarding the at least a portion of the event information further comprises receiving the information regarding the at least a portion of the event information via SOAP-enabled Web Services.

However, in an analogous art, Dev discloses the user receiving tracking information via a webpage (column 41-47, column 12, lines 33-50).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Elliott's event information sent via SOAP-enabled Web Services in Dev's architecture enabling the user to provide subscriber information and receive information on a particular tracked device via a webpage.

As per claim 52, Dev discloses the method of claim 50.

Dev does not explicitly disclose wherein receiving the information regarding the at least a portion of the alerts further comprises receiving the information regarding the at least a portion of the alerts via SOAP-enabled Web Services.

However, in an analogous art, Dev discloses the user receiving tracking information via a webpage (column 41-47, column 12, lines 33-50).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Elliott's event information sent via SOAP-enabled Web Services in Dev's architecture enabling the user to provide subscriber information and receive information on a particular tracked device via a webpage.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barbara N. Burgess whose telephone number is (571) 272-3996. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00am-4:00pm).


Art Unit: 2157

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

June 21, 2006

Barbara N Burgess
Examiner
Art Unit 2157


ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100